REMARKS

The examiner is thanked for the Official action dated November 30, 2005. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive.

The claims were objected to for minor informalities. Claims 1-29 were cancelled rendering this rejection moot. However, the objection to claim 28 was not understood, as there does not appear to be a line 26 in claim 28.

The specification was objected to for minor informalities. The specification was amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments. No new matter has been added. The summary of the invention was also amended commensurate with new claim 30.

Claims 1-11, 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, these rejections are moot in light of cancellation of claims 1-29. New claim 30 substantially mirrors previous claim 28. The rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraphs is not understood. The specification clearly shows and describes a support member 14. Some support member must be disposed between the axle and wheel to facilitate the rotatable interface and otherwise allow for rotational support relative the vehicle. This is well known and readily understood by those of ordinary skill in the art. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph is also not understood. Claim 28 was filed with the original application and clearly the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. The summary of the invention has been amended to provide clear support for claim 30. Applicant is not specifically claiming the precise control law or algorithm. Rather claims

30-31 are directed to a controller controlling the force is response to sensed vehicle conditions. This is clearly supported in the specification.

Figure 5 was objected to because no units are shown and the block diagram does not provide labels. Figure 5 does not contain a block diagram and thus is not understood. The vertical axis of the graph in figure 5 represents a unitless number representative of roll characteristics. The peaks and valleys represent vehicle dynamics that also indicate overshoot as indicated by reference numeral 18. This is well understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. The graph in Figure 5 merely shows the differences in roll characteristics of a suspension with and without the benefits of the present invention. Here again, the reduction in overshoot in the suspension embodying the present inventions is clearly conveyed and easily understood to hose of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 1-10, 12-22, 26 & 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1039a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe 5,390,121, Carlsons 5,284,330 and Karnopp 3,807,678. These rejections are rendered moot in light of cancelled claims 1-29. However, regarding claims 28, the prior art fails to disclose the vehicle suspension system including the magneto-rheological force devices mounted in combination with and independtly from conventional vehicular shock absorbers and coil springs, for controlling roll characteristics of the vehicle. Not only is the art void of this separate and independent force device, it is impermissible to reconstruct applicant invention by piecemeal assembling elements from the prior art.

It is submitted that claims 30-31 define the invention over the prior art and are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiners discover matters that might be resolved by further discussion, they are invited to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Berenato, White & Stavish

Matthew Johnston Reg. No. 41,096

Suite 240

6550 Rock Spring Drive

Bethesda, MD 20817

Tel. (301) 896-0600

Fax. (301) 896-0607

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

March 30, 2006

Reg. No. 1,096

March 30, 2006